



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,571	06/24/2005	Naoe Sakurai	272232US0PCT	6457
22850	7590	04/15/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, THUY-AI N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/15/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/540,571

Applicant(s)

SAKURAI ET AL.

Examiner

THUY-AI N. NGUYEN

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 2- 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: the word "claim" has a capital letter in middle of the sentences. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomarchio et al. (US. 2003/0019508) in view of Klisch et al. (US. 4,554,098).

Regarding claims 1, Tomarchio et al. teach a cleaning composition in wet wipes comprising anionic surfactants [0060- 0073], and zwitterionic surfactants including trimethylglycine (glycine betaine, [0088]), wherein the pH of the composition is preferably from 2 to 4 [0055].

Tomarchio et al. do not teach the ratio of anionic surfactants and trimethylglycine. Klisch et al. teach a detergent composition comprising anionic surfactants (col. 4: 19- 68) and zwitterionic surfactants including lauryldimethylammonioacetate (col. 560- col. 6: 16). Lauryldimethylammonioacetate and trimethylglycine both are zwitterionic

surfactants and have the same backbone. Klisch et al. teach the composition, wherein the ratio of anionic surfactants to the zwitterionic surfactant is 1:2 to 3:1 (col. 6: 17- 30). Tomarchio et al. and Klisch et al. are analogous arts because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely, cleaning composition. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the ratio in the teaching of Klisch et al. in the teaching of Tomarchio et al.. The motivation is to reduce the skin irritation of the cleaning composition (Klisch et al., col. 6: 17- 20).

Regarding claim 2, Tomarchio et al. teach the composition comprising anionic surfactants including alkyl ether sulfate (alkyl phenol ethylene oxide ether sulfate [0070]) in evidence of Klisch et al. (alkyl ether sulfate, col. 2: 27- 35).

Regarding claim 3, Tomarchio et al. teach the composition, wherein anionic surfactant (alkyl sulfate) is present in an amount of 0.6 percent, and C12- C14 betaine in an amount of 0.2 percent (see the table, p. 12). Although Tomarchio et al. do not teach specific amount of trimethylglycine, it would be obvious that Tomarchio et al. will use the same amount of betaine as said above for glycine betaine because they are equivalent alternative that they are zwitterionic surfactants and used for the same purpose of reducing skin irritation [0086- 0092].

Regarding claim 4, Tomarchio et al. teach the composition comprising amphoteric surfactant (amine oxide) in an amount of 0.2 to 0.4 percent (see the table, p. 12).

Regarding claim 5, Tomarchio et al. teach that the composition is a skin detergent composition because the composition is used for cleaning and cleansing a surface, and also for skin care.

Regarding claim 6, Tomarchio et al. teach the composition as said above. Tomarchio et al. do not teach the composition is face wash. However, because the composition comprises the same components as said in the claim, and it is said to use for cleaning a surface including human skin. It would be obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the composition for face wash to meet the wide range of expectation of the user.

Regarding claim 7, Tomarchio et al. teach the composition comprising anionic surfactant and trimethylglycine as said above. However, Tomarchio et al. do not teach the proportion in the range of the applicant. Klisch et al. teach the cleaning composition comprising anionic surfactant (alkyl ether sulfate) in an amount of from 8 to 30 percent (col. 2: 28- 35) and 1 to 8 percent of zwitterionic surfactant (abstract). Tomarchio et al. and Klisch et al. are analogous arts because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely, cleaning composition. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the proportion of anionic surfactant and trimethylglycine of Klisch et al. in the teaching of Tomarchio et al.. The motivation is to achieve a desired counter-irritant level of detergent.

Regarding claim 8, Tomarchio et al. teach the composition having the pH from 1 to 5 [0055] with the balance of water (see the table, p. 12).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klisch et al. (US. 4,554,098) in view of Tomarchio et al. (US. 2003/0019508).

Regarding claim 9, Klisch et al. teach the cleaning composition comprising anionic surfactant (alkyl ether sulfate) in an amount of from 8 to 30 percent (col. 2: 28-35) and 1 to 8 percent of zwitterionic surfactant (abstract), wherein the ratio of anionic surfactant to zwitterionic surfactant is from 1: 2 to 3:1 (col. 6: 17- 30) which is overlap with the range as said the applicant, wherein the pH is in the range of from 5 to 9 (col. 7: 63- 68).

However, Klisch et al. do not teach that the zwitterionic surfactant is trimethylglycine. Tomarchio et al. teach the similar composition, wherein the zwitterionic surfactants derived from the same formula as in the teaching of Klisch et al., wherein the zwitterionic surfactants include trimethylglycine (glycine betaine). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use trimethylglycine of Tomarchio et al. in the teaching of Klisch et al. as an equivalent alternative of zwitterionic surfactants.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THUY-AI N. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3294. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

THA

/David Wu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796